

Application Serial No. 10/529,927
Reply to office action of April 10, 2007

JUL 02 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-4137

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending before this amendment. By the present amendment, claim 5 has been amended to remove minor typographical error. No claim has been amended substantive which may affect the claim scope in this response as none is deemed necessary. No new matter has been added.

In the office action (page 2), claim 5 stands rejected as being dependent on the cancelled claim 4. In response, claim 5 has been amended to depend solely from claim 3. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the office action (page 2), the specification stands objected to for failure to include the priority information in the first page of the disclosure. The specification has been amended accordingly, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the office action (page 2), claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent App. Publ. No. 2003/0061364 (Banerjee) in view of U.S. Patent App. Publ. No. 2004/0072557 (Paila).

All pending claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected in the office action over Banerjee and Paila. More specifically, the examiner asserts in the office action (page 3) that Paila [0036] allegedly teaches the following limitations of the independent claims 1, 3, and 7: --the application including first certification information indicating that the application is proper-- and --wherein the control unit includes second certification information, and determines whether or not the application is proper based on the first certification information included in the application and the second certification information included

Application Serial No. 10/529,927
Reply to office action of April 10, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-4137

in the control unit—.

The applicant respectfully **disagrees**.

Paila [0036] cited by the examiner merely teaches the use of a known verification system utilizing signature or key. In other words, Paila does not teach or suggest determining whether the application is proper or not by using the first certification information included in the application and the second certification information included in the control unit.

Therefore, not all limitations of the independent claims 1, 3, and 7 are not taught or suggested by Benerjee and Paila, whether these references are considered individually or in combination. An indication of allowable subject matter is respectfully requested.

As to the dependent claims 2 and 5-6, the applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least since they depend from one of claims 1 and 3, which are considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 and 5-7 pending in this application are in condition for allowance over the cited reference. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicits an indication of allowable subject matter.

This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner


Application Serial No. 10/529,927
Reply to office action of April 10, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-4137

is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2007



W. William Park, Reg. No. 55,523
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300